

CONCLUSIONS

1. Many things can be used to assist in the footwear putting on and removable process, such as normal chairs, beds, bathtub edges, toilet seats, milk crates, stairs (as pointed out in both Kneier's submission and mine) but none of these items has been specifically designed for the task. Just because something can be used doesn't automatically qualified it as prior art.
2. The only thing common between Santa Cruz's Trash Container with attached Step Stool is the commonality of the use of the name Step Stool! As mentioned above, her invention does not show relevant prior art vis a vis the present invention.
3. Kneier never shows a "stepped stool" having a pair of side frames (14) instead he shows "The chair with attached footrest 11 has a seat 12 and two side panels 14" and the 'cross braces' (30,32) strengthening the footrest are really shelves in another embodiment.
4. In FIG. 6 when Kneier includes the armrests (58,60) he also increased the width of his **chair** to 20 inches instead of 16 and adds a back (56) there is no doubt that the result is a **chair**.
5. While Kneier's **chair with attached footrest** can be used to perform the process, it is **not a stepped stool**. Kneier's device is a **chair**. The title of his submission is **CHAIR WITH ATTACHED FOOTREST**. He never mentions the words "stepped stool" anywhere in his submission. The word "stool" is mentioned three times, but only in his citations of prior art. He mentions the word **chair** 63 times!
6. Finally, Kneier's application was rejected! It was resubmitted as (2005/0218709) with a better drawing of his **chair** and additional prior art references. It resulted in Patent (7,036,887). The first pages of both of these are attached and one can clearly see that his intention was all along to patent a "chair with attached footrest". In his patent, he increased the seat width from 16" to 20" and its depth from 12" to 14" to overcome previous apparent structural difficulties.